Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 10:16 AM
To: 'Marty Spitsen'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Another dumb idea

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thanks Marty - I do like your thoughts. We do take a more regional approach through other planning efforts to ensure that the region is aiming for collective goals and objectives. However, in planning we also like to acknowledge and respond to the needs, challenges, ideas, and unique goals of individual communities as well, which is why are doing the Area Plan work.

As always, I appreciate your insight! ☺

Best,
Crystal

From: Marty Spitsen [mailto:martyspitsen@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 10:25 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Another dumb idea

9/17/13

Good morning Crystal,

After our last community gathering in Kings Beach, I was thinking about the whole process and have an idea for you.
Next time around this bush (15-20 years from now), it seems to me that our Placer county communities should work individually (as we currently are)
and also jointly in a combined effort.
Today, Tahoe City is not in sync with Squaw, Alpine, Truckee, Kings Beach or Homewood.
If ultimately the planning Gods decide to make a change in one area but not others, how could that be considered a cohesive plan?

I know you are trying to be inclusive to the will of all the different areas, but I think the "higher ups" should communicate their goals for the future, and then allow us to offer modifications that would help solve local area issues.

Visitors, as well as the locals would have a more organized grand scheme if the 10,000 foot view of goals were inclusive of an area like the top of Donner to Boca to Eldorado county line to Brockway summit.

Everything that I can think of from public utilities to transportation to commercial development could have a global

127

ATTACHMENT J

view with tinkering allowed locally to solve local issues like protecting a lake view, or promoting river recreation.

Just a thought,
Marty Spitsen
Tahoe City Lumber
715 River Road
Tahoe City, CA
96145
martyspitsen@gmail.com

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:33 AM
To: 'Shannon Eckmeyer'; Jennifer Merchant
Cc: Darcie Goodman Collins; Jennifer Merchant; Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Comments for Conservation Element

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Shannon –

Sorry we will not see you tomorrow night, but we thank you for providing early comment and I would be happy to follow up with you sometime after the workshop.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Shannon Eckmeyer [mailto:shannon@keeptahoeblue.org]
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 3:06 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen; Jennifer Merchant
Cc: Darcie Goodman Collins; Jennifer Merchant
Subject: Comments for Conservation Element

Crystal and Shay,

I will not be able to attend the meeting this Wednesday. Please accept my comments for the policy development for the Conservation Element. Danny Lapin, who I introduced to you both last week, will be there taking notes for the League. He can discuss these comments with you if you have any questions. I can follow up with both of you after the meeting.

Sincerely,
Shannon

Shannon Eckmyer
Policy Analyst
League to Save Lake Tahoe
2608 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
P 530.541.5388 · F 530.541.5454

keeptahoeblue.org
facebook | twitter | news | donate

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 11:13 AM
To: 'Bryan Grunwald'
Cc: Peter Di Domenico; Nicole Hagmaier; Paul Thompson
Subject: RE: Tahoe Basin Community Planning Update, Economic Study

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: TBCP Comments

Hi Bryan,

Thanks for your email. The Existing Conditions Report, along with other existing condition background information (such as SEZ maps, land capability maps, etc.) will be taken into consideration when our Planning Commission considers zoning and allowed land uses for all areas within the Basin portion of Placer County.

We appreciate your comments and will add your email to our file; please note that your comments will be included in Community Plan Update correspondence that we will forward to our Planning Commission.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Bryan Grunwald [mailto:bg@bryangrunwald.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 10:49 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Peter Di Domenico
Subject: Tahoe Basin Community Planning Update, Economic Study

Dear Crystal,

I just read the EPS Economic Study in the attachment to your recent email announcement. The study seems to recommend the Hendrickson Parcel for future hotel uses. This site is severely constrained by SEZ soils. Second, the study fails to discuss the implications of TRPA requirements that any new development be a replacement of existing uses. This makes it very difficult for a developer to acquire property to offset new development, increasing risk and adversely affecting financial feasibility. Given the lack of hotel rooms (real warm beds not

130

condos) the County should consider asking an exemption from this policy to allow new visitor serving uses to be developed. In summary, the report should be revised to address the SEZ constraint and the building replacement policy discussed above.

Best,

Bryan

Bryan E. Grunwald
Bryan Grunwald Associates
Planning & Architecture
6440 Hillegass Avenue
Oakland, CA 94618
P 510.420.1812
F 510.420.1819
E bg@bryangrunwald.com

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 10:36 AM
To: 'Leah Kaufman'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: kings beach vision

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: TBCP Comments

Hi Leah,

We do not have printed colored copies of the Kings Beach Vision Plan, or the Tahoe City Town Center Visioning Options booklet. However, the Kings Beach Vision Plan was just released on our webpage under Plan Area Teams – North Tahoe East Plan Area:

http://www.placer.ca.gov/Home/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoeBasinCPUpdate.aspx

The initial Tahoe City Town Center Visioning Options booklet that was prepared last summer and sponsored by Tahoe City downtown stakeholders is available on the NLTRA webpage. Any information related to Placer County's August 28th workshop on that visioning options booklet – this includes the powerpoint, the notes, the modified visioning options principles and the modified visioning options diagram, are also available on our webpage. They can be found under Community Workshops and Meetings and then the Aug 28 meeting materials:

http://www.placer.ca.gov/Home/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoeBasinCPUpdate.aspx

We've revised our Tahoe Basin CP Update webpage as part of the County's overhaul of its entire website, so if you have trouble finding these materials, please let me know and I can help guide you to them.

Hope all is well!

Best,

Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Leah Kaufman [mailto:leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 9:33 AM

To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: kings beach vision

Hi Crystal
I was out of town for the vision workshop and town meeting. Is it possible to get the colored booklets for Kings Beach and Tahoe City?

Leah
Kaufman Planning and Consulting
PO. Box 253
Carnelian Bay, CA
96140

530-546-4402

133

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 10:26 AM
To: 'Ellie'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Please send the list of Technical Working Group members

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: TBCP Comments

Hi Ellie –

Sorry for my delayed response to your email. The TAC contains members representing various County Departments/Divisions, as well as other outside agencies. I've separated them out in two tables below.

Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

Here is the list of Placer County representatives:

Rebecca Taber	Engineering
Rich Moorehead	DPW
Mark Rideout	Facilities
Andy Fisher	Facilities
Tim Wegner	Building Division
Ken Sibley	Building Division - Tahoe Area
Wesley Nicks	Environmental Health
Brad Albertazzi	Placer County Fire Protection
Karin Schwab	Legal
Amber Conboy	DPW
Crystal Jacobsen	Planning
Jennifer Merchant	CEO
Paul Thompson	Planning
Edmund Sullivan	Planning
Steve Buelna	CDRA
Peter Kraatz	DPW Tahoe

Allen Breuch	Planning Tahoe
Paul Griffith	Placer Economic Development
Christine Onesi	CDRA/GIS

Here is a list of outside agency representatives:

Shay Navarro	TRPA
Harold Singer	Lahontan
Doug Smith	Lahontan
Patrick Wright	Calif/Tahoe Conservancy
Ray Lacey	Calif/Tahoe Conservancy
Cindy Gustafson	TCPUD
Paul Schultz	NTPUD
Jeff Ausnow	PC Sheriff Substation - Tahoe
Mike Schwartz	N Tahoe Fire Protection Dist
Peter Poe	N Tahoe Fire Protection Dist
Mike Lefreve	US Forest Service - Tahoe
Mary Hays	State Lands Commission
Steven Gaytan	Caltrans District 3
Bill Lindemann	California State Parks
Marilyn Lin	California State Parks
John Britto	Tahoe Truckee Unified School District
Angel Green	Placer APCD
Tricia York	California Tahoe Conservancy

From: Ellie [mailto:tahoellie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 8:59 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Michael Johnson
Subject: Please send the list of Technical Working Group members

Hi Crystal,
This evening you stated there are approx. 37 stakeholders. Could you send me the list of who they are.

Thanks, Ellie

135

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2013 10:48 AM
To: 'Rlda7@aol.com'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Parcel zoning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Ruth,

That site is currently zoned 016A Carnelian Woods Residential and with the Community Update effort that is underway, it is unlikely that the County will be proposing a change to the residential zoning. However, we may be proposing some allowances for small-scale retail/commercial uses (i.e., corner market, coffee shop, etc.) in certain residential zones to help balance or complete neighborhoods.

Under the existing zoning, the following uses are allowed on this site:

Residential
Public Services (facilities, etc.)
Recreation (sports facilities, day use, etc.)
Resource Management (forest management, restoration, etc.)

That said, you are welcome to provide a written request to our Planning Commission for a zone change consideration. However, it is important to note that while the County may support such a request given the site's proximity to the commercial core in Carnelian Bay, it may be more challenging to gain TRPA support; and ultimately, the County will be responsible to demonstrate that the County's Community/Area Plans conform to the TRPA Regional Plan.

Should you wish to provide a written request for a rezone, you should direct it to the Placer County Planning Commission and send it to the attention of Nicole Hagmaier who is our clerk keeping the records/requests for our Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update. She will forward to our Planning Commission for their consideration at our next Planning Commission Public Workshop.

Feel free to contact me should you have any further questions.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Rlda7@aol.com [mailto:Rlda7@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2013 9:48 AM

To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Re: Parcel zoning

Good morning.Chrystal, Thank you for your quick response to my request. Carnelian Woods (CW) location/Assesssor's Parcel Number (APN) is: 116-180-016-000 located at Latitude 39.2 N; Longitude -120.08 W. (I write Forestry grants), but I am not knowledgeable concerning lots and lot parcels. One of our Board members, Cary Okmura, is an architect and indicated that we should ask for a "split lot" commercial designation, since our tennis courts are just to the east of this building. It was the sales office for the original developer. I have already spoken to Bruce Seybold,our registerd forester, regarding the Carnelian Woods boundaries for a grant we will be submitting to the California Fire Safe Council. He might be able to e-mail you some of the maps of CW if that would be of help. The building is on Carnelian Woods avenue; the parking lot is utilized by VP's of the Cours' de Elegans (sp?) boat show as it is so close to the marina.
Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Most Sincerely, Ruth

In a message dated 8/14/2013 8:41:52 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, CJacobse@placer.ca.gov writes:

Hi Ruth –

Thanks for your email. Can you provide us with the Assessor Parcel Number or address for that site so that I can accurately check its existing zoning and our proposed draft zoning? Once I have that I will look into this and get right back to you.

Thanks,

Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603

530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Rlda7@aol.com [mailto:Rlda7@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 2:38 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Parcel zoning

Dear Ms. Jacobsen, I am a resident of Carnelian Woods in Carnelian Bay, I know that you have been working to accomplish TRPA'S Regional Plan Update for the Tahoe City and Kings Beach areas. I assume there are also some plans underway for the Carnelian Bay-Tahoe Vista area, which is why I am contacting you. I asked Kristi Boosman who I should contact regarding a building owned by Carnelian Woods, to see if we can get it zoned "commercial". It was leased by the Sheriff's office a few years ago but is now empty.It sits next to the miniature golf course and across the street from the boat storage lot in Carnelian Bay... (about 400 yards from the lake shore.) It is a perfect example of the TRPA effort to recycle old buildings. It is now in great need of repair, but it seems foolish to me to repair it until we know how it could be used. (It is quite an attractive building with several parking spaces.)

I am on the Board of The Carnelian Woods homeowners association. We have had many discussions on what we should do with this building. As I understand it, it is now zoned for single family residence or real estate office. Can you give me any contact or information that could help us in determining the fate of this building? Thank you.

Sincerely, Ruth Dworsky, Forestry chair, Carnelian Woods

Phone: 530-546-5451

=

138

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 8:25 AM
To: 'Wally Auerbach'; The Paper Trail
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier; Paul Thompson; Jennifer Merchant; Michael Johnson; Gary Davis; Harold Slear; Jim Williamson; Kathie Fenley; Marguerite Sprague; Martin Spitsen; Zach Hymanson; Jennifer Montgomery; Steve Kastan
Subject: RE: August 28 Tahoe City Vision Options Plan Public Review Workshop

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Wally & Judy –

To open up the August 28th workshop, we wanted to give both your team and the downtown stakeholder group (that sponsored the Vision Options Plan) a chance to briefly talk about each of your visioning efforts. Your team is not required to do this, we just wanted to provide an opportunity for your team to offer up your collective visioning thoughts about the future of Tahoe City should you desire to do so. This is something we did at the beginning of the Kings Beach Charrette workshop and the North Tahoe East team really liked being involved in this manner – being able to address the public themselves and having direct access to the design consultants.

If your team would rather not participate in the opening statements, we will be happy to give a briefing of your team's work done to date at the August 28th workshop. We can talk more about this and more about the overall scope of the workshop at our meeting next week on the 21st.

Sorry for any confusion that this has caused.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Wally Auerbach [mailto:WAuerbach@auerbachengineering.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:34 PM
To: The Paper Trail
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier; Paul Thompson; Jennifer Merchant; Michael Johnson; Crystal Jacobsen; Gary Davis; Harold Slear; Jim Williamson; Kathie Fenley; Marguerite Sprague; Martin Spitsen; Zach Hymanson
Subject: RE: August 28 Tahoe City Vision Options Plan Public Review Workshop

I did ask that question, but so far I haven't heard any suggestions or revisions from the County..

Wally

From: The Paper Trail [mailto:judy@tahoepapertrail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 8:37 AM
To: 'Crystal Jacobsen'; 'Gary Davis'; 'Harold Slear'; 'Jim Williamson'; 'Kathie Fenley'; 'Marguerite Sprague'; 'Martin Spitsen'; Wally Auerbach; 'Zach Hymanson'
Cc: 'Nicole Hagmaier'; 'Paul Thompson'; 'Jennifer Merchant'; 'Michael Johnson'
Subject: RE: August 28 Tahoe City Vision Options Plan Public Review Workshop

I'm getting really confused (so what's new!).....are you expecting the Planning Team to present conclusions from the Visioning Process? Why not have the people involved in that (although there are a few overlaps) present that? All our team has done is reviewed the objectives to see what we do and do not agree with.....

Judy Friedman
The Paper Trail Secretarial & Business Solutions
PO Box 6178
Tahoe City, CA 96145
530-581-5692
fax: 530-581-5695

From: Crystal Jacobsen [mailto:CJacobse@placer.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 3:22 PM
To: Gary Davis; Harold Slear; Jim Williamson; Judy Friedman; Kathie Fenley; Marguerite Sprague; Martin Spitsen; Walter Auerbach; Zach Hymanson
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier; Paul Thompson; Jennifer Merchant; Michael Johnson
Subject: August 28 Tahoe City Vision Options Plan Public Review Workshop

Hi everyone –

I wanted to email all of you with the event flyer and agenda for the August 28, 2013 Tahoe Vision Options Plan Public Review Workshop that your team will be helping to lead. We will be reviewing the attached agenda at our August 21, 2013 pre-meeting with your team. Any help that your team can provide in outreaching to your community with the attached flyer would be greatly appreciated.

Please note that I will be sending additional documents next week for our August 21 meeting.

Thank you all for your help and commitment to this process.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 1:24 PM
To: sandy@puretahoenorth.com
Cc: Jennifer Merchant; Nicole Hagmaier; Paul Thompson
Subject: August 28th Tahoe City Vision Options Plan Public REview/Workshop

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Sandy,

I wanted to follow up with you regarding the August 28th workshop for the Tahoe City Vision Options Plan. As I am sure you are aware, the workshop time has been modified: **it is now from 6:00-9:00PM**.

As discussed with you over the phone on Thursday July 25th, we would like to provide an opportunity for a representative of the Vision Options Plan downtown stakeholder group to speak at the start of the August 28 workshop. We will put your representative near the front of the agenda for 5-10 minutes, where they can briefly talk about the key elements of the vision options plan, etc. We are also providing our County's Tahoe City Plan Team the same opportunity to discuss the visioning work they have done. We are putting together 3-4 slides to add to the Powerpoint presentation for the workshop, with the County's team will be using, and would be happy to do the same for your representative should they need/want them. Please note however, that Design Workshop will be there to provide an in-depth presentation of the Vision Options Plan to the public, so it is not necessary for your representative to go into too much detail of the Visions Options Plan, but rather just simply offer a brief overview.

That said, we are putting together the workshop agenda and draft Powerpoint slides this week, so please let me know if you would like to add a couple of slides to the Powerpoint. And I will also send out the agenda to you as soon as I have it. Also, please note that we will be at the Granlibakken early on the August 28 for the workshop – probably around 5pm, so we will have time before the presentation to do any last minute coordination if needed.

Thanks again Sandy for your partnership in this effort.

Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

141

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 12:50 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Beach El Capitan and Obexer's Marina

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

For the record...

From: sgearhart.fows@gmail.com [mailto:sgearhart.fows@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Susan Gearhart
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 10:25 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Beach El Capitan and Obexer's Marina

Cyrstal,

Please see these attachments. The Land down Tahoe Ski Bowl Way to Lake Tahoe is still called El Capitan. The land between El Capitan to Obexers is owned by Placer County and was suppose to be a public beach. It is Lake Ave. historically; however, when the Truckee Dam was built, Lake Ave went under water. The Friends of the West Shore have discussed this with Peter Kratz in the past, and it is still suppose to be access to the lake but Placer's Lake Ave. is also a public beach and we chose to have a beach rather than attempt to just use the access and move out, we'd like to have picnics and enjoy the children play. Prior to the end of the closure of the Area Plans for the West Shore, we'd like a beach by Placer County to be available to us in the community.

Thanks you,

Susan

--
****
Susan R. Gearhart, President
Friends of the West Shore
P.O. Box 5095, Tahoe City, CA 96145
Phone: 530.525.0368
www.FriendsWestShore.org
****
"Working together to protect the West Shore, our watersheds, wildlife and rural quality of life, for today and future generations."

142

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 6:46 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: TC planning

FYI – for the file.

Thanks.

From: Marty Spitsen [mailto:martyspitsen@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 9:12 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: TC planning

6/19/12

Good morning Crystal,

Thanks for the email. Sometimes I feel like the rest of you know much more than I do and I am in the position of playing catch up. The only way I can do that is to question things when they do not make sense to me. Believe me, I am not trying to be a liability to the process.

I feel that many of the goals discussed so far are valid for any community. Easy access for walking, biking, and public transportation are vital to any commerical or recreational area. Examples like Santa Barbara, Jackson Hole and Santa Fe prove the point. If these activities help the environment, so much the better.

However, I think that there are many other factors that will be necessary for the commerical core of Tahoe City to thrive. First, businesses need to be able to grow and modify their operations. Over time cost go up. The only way for a business to continue to pay the costs is to either grow, or reduce their operating expenses. Reducing the operating expenses is what the business owners have been trying to do for about the last decade and to town is worse for it. Reduction in employees, wages, profits and building improvements are taking its toll to the point that given a choice, passing cars don't want to stop.

Secondly, the passing cars need a place to stop. Not only do the businesses need to be able to grow, (or change their model), but parking needs to be increased to accommodate any growth. Future zoning and regulations should encourage not discourage flexability so owners can adapt to or modify for our changing world.

Unfortunately, both of these common sense observations require making the town physically larger, which some seem to think is a bad idea. My thinking is that if we want to have a chance to achieve the above goals, compromises as well as innovative ideas will have to be made in the allowable zoning and agency regulations to benefit all involved.

I am hoping that the next twenty years will be both environmentally advantages and prosperous for the entire community and I hope that is the reason we are having these meetings.

Marty
--
Marty Spitsen
Tahoe City Lumber
715 River Road
Tahoe City, CA
96145
martyspitsen@gmail.com

144

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Edmund Sullivan; Paul Thompson; Steve Buelna; Allen Breuch
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Tahoe City Area Plan Update-Response to Letter from LTSLT

FYI

From: Shannon Eckmeyer [mailto:shannon@keeptahoeblue.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 11:22 AM
To: Wally Auerbach
Cc: Darcie Collins; Jennifer Merchant; Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: RE: Tahoe City Area Plan Update-Response to Letter from LTSLT

Wally,

I appreciate your response to my concerns. I understand that this is just a vision your team was discussing. However, after talking to both TRPA staff and Crystal Jacobsen I was not convinced that this idea would be fully vetted with all stakeholders in the Basin before it was decided on by your team. As you are well aware, the League to Save Lake Tahoe was a member of the Bi-State group for the RPU, and the expansion of Town Center boundaries was, and remains, a critical issue. I have been in conversations with Crystal Jacobsen and TRPA staff throughout your planning process. I was discouraged when I heard such a drastic expansion was being discussed. While I believe the visioning of the Greater Tahoe City Plan Area Team should remain within your planning group, such proposals that could set precedent throughout the entire Basin need to be discussed in a larger forum.

I thought it was only appropriate for the Governing Board to be prepared for any future proposal. I apologize for any misunderstanding I may have caused and hope to remain transparent and communicate with all members of all teams, Placer County, and TRPA throughout your planning process. As I have told Crystal and Jennifer many times, I feel that your process has been the most public and transparent. In the future I will do my due diligence with vetting concerns I see to your team. I have told Crystal that I believe there other ways to accomplish the vision you are hoping for rather than expanding a Town Center boundary so drastically. I will be at all of the next Placer County public community meetings (including tomorrow night). If you would like to set up a time for me to talk with you and anyone from your team, I am happy to do so.

Regards,

Shannon

From: Wally Auerbach [mailto:WAuerbach@auerbachengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Shannon Eckmeyer
Cc: Darcie Collins
Subject: Tahoe City Area Plan Update-Response to Letter from LTSLT

Shannon:

On behalf of the Greater Tahoe City Plan Area Team, please see attached response to your letter dated May 29, 2013 to the TRPA Board.

Thanks for your consideration.

145

Wally Auerbach
530-581-1116 Ext. 11

146

Tahoe City Vision Statement

Tahoe City, at the headwaters of the Truckee River, is the hub of the Lake Tahoe region and a vibrant commercial center, where visitors and residents are stewards of Tahoe's precious natural environment and rich cultural heritage. Tahoe City businesses thrive as residents live and recreate in close proximity to their jobs.

June 12, 2013

Shannon Eckmeyer-Policy Analyst
League to Save Lake Tahoe
2608 Lake Tahoe Blvd.
South Lake Tahoe, CA. 96150

Dear Ms. Eckmeyer:

The Greater Tahoe City Plan Area Team (Plan Team) has received a copy of your May 29, 2013 letter to the TRPA Board, regarding our initial ideas and advice for land uses within the Tahoe City area.

We were disappointed to find numerous factual errors in your letter regarding our recommendations to include the Tahoe City Golf Course and the "64-Acre" parcel into the Tahoe City Town Center. It is unnecessary to address these errors one by one. The bottom line is that the League has completely misunderstood, and now publically mischaracterized, our position on this subject.

While we welcome and appreciate the League's interest in the work we are doing, it is disruptive to the process for the League to take a public position on thoughts and ideas that come from the Plan Team's *preliminary* discussions. These thoughts and ideas have not been fully vetted within the Plan Team, they have not been incorporated into anything final the County has produced for public review, and certainly (as you pointed out) they have not been vetted in the context of the Regional Plan Update. Exploring all sides of a given topic is our charge, and we need your help to do so without fear that the working discussions will be prematurely misrepresented to the public, and used to incite unwarranted upset. That approach only works to divide us and the other interests with legitimate input.

The Plan Team is interested in incorporating the Tahoe City Golf Course and the "64-Acre" parcel into a unified vision for the future of Tahoe City. Both parcels are intimately woven into the fabric of our town through recreation, transportation, associated commerce, and also through our history. To ignore these properties is to ignore our lifestyles, our livelihoods, our environment, and our heritage, and no one signed up for this committee to discard these important attributes. Moreover, our inclusion of these areas does not equate to advocating for monstrous new developments on these properties. To the contrary, including these areas allows for open and unified planning especially relating to surrounding land uses and habitat restoration. As residents, business owners, and employees in Tahoe City we deeply care about the welfare and environment of our region. The County purposefully assembled our team to represent different perspectives and find common ground through open and thoughtful discussion.

We encourage the League to devote its energies to increasing its understanding of the planning process Placer County is pursuing, and communicating constructive ideas in support of that process.

Sincerely,
Greater Tahoe City Plan Area Team

Jim Williamson	Hal Slear	Kathie Fenley
Marguerite Sprague	Zach Hymanson	Gary Davis
Marty Spitzen	Judy Friedman	Wally Auerbach

Cc: Placer County (various departments)
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Board & Staff

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 8:15 AM
To: 'hoytbw@yahoo.com'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Placer County Kings Beach Vision Charrette
Attachments: Archived attachment list

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Brian,

I appreciate your email and your feedback – you are certainly right, a charrette is a planning design term that not all know, so our apologies for not defining the word when sending out our email.

A charrette is an intensive planning or community design session where citizens, designers and others collaborate on a vision for development. It provides a forum for ideas and offers the unique advantage of giving immediate feedback to the designers. We encourage your participation at this event and again, appreciate your input on our email blast.

Feel free to contact me should you have any questions – I would be happy to talk further with you about the process.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Brian Hoyt [mailto:hoytbw@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Placer County Planning
Subject: Re: Placer County Kings Beach Vision Charrette

Charrette, not in my dictionary. We are common folks in Kings Beach and not impressed by your insider lingo. I do have an MBA, but in business, it best to try to relate to people you work for(tax payers) without being ostentatious. See I can use big word also.

Brian Hoyt

From: Placer County Planning <Planning@placer.ca.gov>
To: Placer County Planning <Planning@placer.ca.gov>

148

Sent: Monday, June 3, 2013 1:26 PM
Subject: Placer County Kings Beach Vision Charrette

Attention Lake Tahoe Community –

As part of Placer County's efforts to update its Community/General Plans in the Tahoe Basin, the County will be conducting a Vision Charrette this summer for the community of Kings Beach.

The County's intent is for the Kings Beach Vision Charrette to build upon the foundation established through the TRPA's Pathway 2007 and Placer County's Tahoe Community Plan Update visioning and community planning efforts to create a Vision Plan that illustrates the possibilities for the future of the Kings Beach commercial core and recreation areas as it evolves over the next 20+ years.

The planning process intends to engage a broad audience to confirm the outcomes of the work done to date and provide an opportunity to generate new ideas that consider elements such as environmental restoration, prosperity, connectivity, recreation, quality of life, and new opportunities afforded with the Regional Plan Update and the Kings Beach Commercial Core Streetscape Improvements. The plan will add to the previously established visioning and principles to address additional opportunities associated with the community, environment, economic, and art within Kings Beach. It will examine where restoration, land uses and connections can support the realization of the principles and it will contain a gallery of images to illustrate some of the visioning ideas. This work will help to inform Placer County's Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update.

Scheduled public workshops and sessions where community members will be able to meet and discuss their ideas with the project team and see the Vision Plan transform from written thoughts to illustrative graphics and images include:

Kings Beach Pre-Charrette Workshop
June 19, 2013 from 5:00-6:30PM
North Tahoe Event Center
8318 North Lake Tahoe Blvd., Kings Beach

Kings Beach 3-Day Vision Charrette
July 16-18, 2013
North Tahoe Event Center
8318 North Lake Tahoe Blvd., Kings Beach
Public Sessions:
July 16 – 12:00-1:30PM and 5:00-6:30PM

149

July 18 – 5:00-6:00PM

All are invited to bring their thoughts and ideas regarding the opportunities for the future of Kings Beach! For more information on the meeting dates for the Kings Beach Vision Charrette and the County's Community Plan Update, please contact Crystal Jacobsen with the Placer County Planning Services Division at: 530.745.3000 or cjacobse@placer.ca.gov, or visit our website at:

http://www.placer.ca.gov/Home/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoeBasinCPUpdate.aspx

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 1:12 PM
To: 'Jan Brisco'; Edmund Sullivan
Cc: Jmtornese@aol.com; Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Homewood Commercial v. Residential -
Attachments: Archived attachment list

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good – we will set up a focused team meeting from 4:00-5:30PM on the 13th at the County's Tahoe City office again and will send out an email to the team by the end of the day.

Thanks everyone for all your research and input.

Crystal

From: Jan Brisco [mailto:janbrisco@ltol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:41 PM
To: Edmund Sullivan; Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Jmtornese@aol.com
Subject: RE: Homewood Commercial v. Residential -

Works for me.

From: Edmund Sullivan [mailto:ESulliva@placer.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:12 PM
To: 'Jan Brisco'; Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Jmtornese@aol.com
Subject: RE: Homewood Commercial v. Residential -

Hey Jan,
As stated early, single-family residential can definitely be a standalone use in a mixed-use district. That said, getting the group back together to discuss is needed. Does June 13th from 4-5pm work? If not I'll send out a doddle pole to determine a date that does. As to the TRPA Plan Area Statement which classified Homewood as commercial, we discovered that the underlying TRPA zoning is residential, which is consistent with West Shore Plan land use classification for that area. Confusing, but at least the perceived inconsistency is no longer an issue.

Regards,
Edmund Sullivan

From: Jan Brisco [mailto:janbrisco@ltol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 11:33 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen; Edmund Sullivan
Cc: Jmtornese@aol.com
Subject: Homewood Commercial v. Residential -

151

Greetings:

It's been some time since our meeting and the discussion we were having regarding the discrepancies between TRPA Plan Area Statements in Homewood, and those the County adopted as part of its West Shore General Plan. Additionally, the letter from then Planning Director Fred Yaeger further explaining the situation years ago.

My notes indicated that you would be back to us with clarification and suggested resolution of the pertinent issues for the Homewood area, and if there are other areas on the West Shore where the County and TRPA differed in their use clasifications. Is there an update you can provide while this issue is fresh in our minds?

Several of the homeowners in this area desire this be kept as residential, however, we needed to know if the Multi-Use designation will allow residential use as a stand-alone use, or if it needs to be associated with another use category such as commercial, etc., in order for it to be approved.

Your prompt reply is greatly appreciated.

Best, Jan

152

KEEP TAHOE BLUE.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Date: May 29, 2013
To: Members of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board
From: The League to Save Lake Tahoe

Re: Comments on Placer County Area Plan Process

Dear members of the Governing Board,

The League to Save Lake Tahoe appreciates the opportunity to comment on the area planning process, in particular, we have concerns with the Placer County Area Plans. Through recent meetings and conversations, the League has been informed that Placer County wants to significantly expand one of its Town Center boundaries. The proposal is to expand the Tahoe City Town Center to include all of the Tahoe City Golf Course and an additional 64 acres on the opposite side of the Town Center. This is a major concern for the League as this would conflict with the intentions of the Bi-State Agreement in directing redevelopment. It is unknown at this time whether this expansion would meet all of the necessary requirements of TRPA that are found in 13.5.3.E. Allowing such a great expansion could have significant environmental impacts and would set an inappropriate precedent for future Town Center changes. Town Centers were defined during the Regional Plan Update process to reflect concentrated areas of development that would encourage redirecting intensive land use to appropriate areas that are currently densely developed. Adding hundreds of acres of increased density, coverage and height is counter to the intentions of the Regional Plan Update and the Bi-State Agreement.

This proposal is not definite and has not been confirmed. However, the League wanted to bring this issue to the attention of the members of the Governing Board. While Placer County has done an incredible job of including the public through this planning process, discussion surrounding this proposal has not been made public. The League has brought its concern to staff in Placer County and will continue to work closely with them and TRPA as the Area Plans are developed.

Sincerely,

Shannon Eckmeyer

League to Save Lake Tahoe Policy Analyst

League to Save Lake Tahoe · 2608 Lake Tahoe Boulevard · South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 · 530.541.5388 · f 530.541.5454 · keeptahoeblue.org

Printed on recycled paper

Nicole Hagmaier

From:	Crystal Jacobsen
Sent:	Wednesday, May 29, 2013 12:13 PM
To:	'Andrew Ryan'
Cc:	Paul Thompson; Jennifer Merchant; Jennifer Montgomery; Nicole Hagmaier; Steve Kastan; Michael Johnson
Subject:	RE: The vision meeting before the vision meeting
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Hi Andrew,

Thanks for your email. As I discussed in our phone conversation on May 22nd , and as noted by Supervisor Montgomery in her email response to you, the County has outlined a very inclusive process for the Kings Beach Vision Charrette, as we have done for the entirety of the Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update process.

The May 30th "Information Gathering Meeting" that the County and our consultants are conducting is typical of any planning process, where we seek key information from agencies/associations and other governmental partners regarding existing plans, future projects, policies, etc. This information becomes a framework for which we need to work within and is critical in understanding before we embark upon the Charrette. As noted above, the County has worked hard to execute a public outreach strategy for the Tahoe Basin Community Plan that is inclusive; and this "Information Gathering Meeting" is not intended to be contrary to that effort. Rather, this meeting is standard planning practice, as it is not usual for staff and consultants to hold meetings to seek key information in the early stages of a planning process. As noted on the phone with you, the following agencies/associations will be participating at this meeting: the CTC, NTPUD, NLT Fire, State Parks, State Department of Boating and Waterways, TTD, Cal Fire, NLTRA, NTBA, CALTRANS, Placer CEO, Placer CDRA, Placer DPW, Placer Economic Development, Placer Planning Services, Design Workshop (consultants), and TRPA.

As I also discussed on the phone with you, in lieu of "Stakeholder" Interviews with various business owners or land use professionals, etc., the County made the decision to host a "Pre-Charrette Workshop" that is open to the public and is for the purpose of seeking broad public input from business owners, property owners, residents, land use/development professionals or planners, employers, etc. Following that workshop, we will host a 3-day Charrette, that will also include public sessions. Our consultants are currently developing flyers and agendas for these events and as soon as we have those, we will be distributing to them public - we will be posting to our website, sending out to the Plan Area Teams and other various Tahoe email blasts and news releases. Here is a schedule for those events:

Pre-Charrette Workshop
June 19, 2013 from 5:00PM-6:30PM
North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach

Kings Beach Vision 3-Day Charrette
July 16-18, 2013
North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach
Public Sessions:
July 16 – 1:00PM-2:00PM and 5:00PM-6:00PM
July 18 – 5:00PM-6:30PM

Finally, as noted to you on the phone, the North Tahoe East Team (for which you have served as an alternate) will be helping the County and the consultants in the Charrette process. Two members of the team will be presenting their team's vision to the public at the June 19th meeting. In addition, the team will be participating in a Charrettee staff & design team de-briefing meeting on July 17 from 8:00AM-9:00AM, where we will all discuss the June 19, and July 16 public sessions before the design team begins their design work.

We appreciate your commitment to this process, value all your input, and encourage your participation at the public meetings identified above. I hope this helps to clarify the County's decision making on the Kings Beach Vision Charrette process.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Andrew Ryan [mailto:andrew@prdei.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 4:12 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: RE: The vision meeting before the vision meeting

Hi Crystal-
Checking in on our conversation from last week regarding the planning meetings before the public meetings.

I had requested an attendee list via email (see below) and on the phone with you that day.

From my research, TOT funding has been used to secure the planning grants that are funding the KB Community Plan update and KB Visioning meeting.

As you may surmise, concerns are mounting in whom is planning my future, where my voice is not welcomed or prohibited. Given the status of my inclusion (non-Agency), I am left to assume this meeting(s) would be held at a public place and not at a private location.

I apologize for not being rebuked readily. Persistence is relative to investment. My shoes are available to be walked in, if understanding is sought.

Please allay my concerns, by circulation of the invite list, agenda/location of meeting, and an invite to attend.

Falling short of the above, I request formal attendance denial in writing. Email sufficient, letterhead preferred.

Sincerely,

Andrew Ryan

From: Andrew Ryan [mailto:andrew@prdei.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 8:05 AM
To: CJacobse@placer.ca.gov
Subject: The vision meeting before the vision meeting

Hi Crystal-

I've heard chatter about a pre-meeting before the Kings Beach visioning.

I'd like to through my hat in for consideration as a property owner, business owner, TOT tax payer, and employer in Kings Beach.

Also, can you please let me know the current list of invited folks?

Best
Andrew

156

5-22-12

Dear Crystal

Thank you for getting back to me. My family is very interested in pursuing a change in zoning or use for our property at 2980 N.Lake Blvd, APN # 093-130-015. I would also appreciate if you would put me and my real estate agent on your notification list for any meetings or workshops for the Lake Forest area.

Thank you

E.F. Bertagnolli

E.F. Bertagnolli Phone # 530-386-1878

Park Bechdolt Hester Real Estate Phone # 530-308-6004 or email parkbechdolt@yahoo.com

157

Nicole Hagmaier

Subject: FW: Homewood Letters -

From: Jan Brisco [mailto:janbrisco@ltol.com]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:00 PM
To: Jmtornese@aol.com; Edmund Sullivan; Nicole Hagmaier; Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: RE: Homewood Letters -

Greetings:

I've conducted research into the TRPA and Placer County West Shore General Plan processes. While the TRPA shows the area as Commercial, the planning statement recognizes SFD as a special use. The County did not follow that for their approval, and instead, felt the area needed protection from blanket commercial zoning. In fact, there are a number of areas throughout the plan that wanted to recognize the existing residential as an important component to keeping the west shore's character intact.

The problem lies in how the County and TRPA were going about resolving these planning conflicts. Early on the the Pathway 2007 process, I recall having several discussions with Bill Combs about how and when these conflicts would rise to the level for discussion, and he assured me they would be dealt with at the community planning level. Essentially, where we are today. I believe we should re-examine all of the planning areas we've dealt with so far, perhaps having a final meeting with the team to review and resolve those conflicts where they occur.

I think Fred Yaeger's letter to the Cress family (10/22/1997) was informative, however, did not offer any resolution between the County and TRPA zoning issues. In fact, it appears the County was offering residential as the planning solution to the issue.

I think we have established the Mixed Use Designation for the general area, and you are checking to confirm Single Family Residences (without any other use) are an allowed use for this plan area. I'm not sure if we need to have any special planning areas within the plan area to speak to the uses that we might want to ensure maintain the historical use.

Thank you, and I remain available to help resolve these issues.

Jan

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 9:50 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Concerned Property Owner

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

For the record...

From: Ruth Ellen Saarinen [mailto:RESaarinen@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 4:54 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen; astockham@trpa.org; mambler@trpa.org
Subject: Concerned Property Owner

I am unable to attend the planned meetings, but am very concerned about the proliferation of larger homes, poor access to the lakeshore, increasingly obstructed views of the lake, increased density in areas away from the cities around the lake, increased pollution, and poor communication directly from the agencies to property owners. I understand the need for revenue, and maybe you don't think that little property owners matter, but put yourselves in the shoes of the property owners and give consideration to the quality and integrity of your decisions about the impact of your actions on the future of Lake Tahoe and its residents.

Thanks.

Ruth Ellen Saarinen
408 McKinney Rubicon Springs Dr
Tahoma

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 1:03 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Tahoe CP North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East - Focused Team Meetings

FYI

From: Gary Davis [mailto:garydavis@garydavisgroup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 12:47 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: David Boesch
Subject: RE: Tahoe CP North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East - Focused Team Meetings

Hi:

Although my comments were attached to the west/east email, I knew we were meeting tomorrow and what the general topic is.

My overall concern is that this process seems to be planned to take far longer than necessary. Other communities around the lake are far ahead of us. I know our team is anxious to make better progress sooner. We feel that this elongated process will wear out all the volunteers before it is over and none us will be left to see it through. We are willing to put in the effort to move it faster. I have mentioned this to David Boesch before and intend do it with others again shortly.

If we had a over all game plan and schedule, and stuck to it, I believe we could get through this much, much quicker. Of course we need the county staff and their resources to move quickly as well if we are all going to see a successful end.

Opportunites for significant improvements and change for our community are right now today.

Gary Davis

GARY DAVIS GROUP
DESIGN AND ENGINEERING

po box 7409 165 river rd tahoe city, ca 96145
530.583.9222 fax 583.9294
garydavisgroup.com

From: Crystal Jacobsen [mailto:CJacobse@placer.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 12:32 PM
To: 'Gary Davis'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Tahoe CP North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East - Focused Team Meetings

Hi Gary,

160

The May 14th meeting will include ONLY team meetings with the North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East Teams. Your team is meeting tomorrow night and will not be meeting on the 14th. We include ALL teams on meeting notices just to keep everyone in the loop.

There will be an agenda for the May 14th meeting and it will be available next week. It will be very similar to the last meeting that your team had – continued work on the land use classification tables and further discussion on scale/height.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Gary Davis [mailto:garydavis@garydavisgroup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Tahoe CP North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East - Focused Team Meetings

Do we have an agenda for this meeting, so that we know what to prepare for??

Gary Davis

GARY DAVIS GROUP
DESIGN AND ENGINEERING

po box 7409 165 river rd tahoe city, ca 96145
530.583.9222 fax 583.9294
garydavisgroup.com

From: Nicole Hagmaier [mailto:NHagmaie@placer.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2013 9:21 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: Tahoe CP North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East - Focused Team Meetings

Hello North Tahoe West and North Tahoe East Plan Area Teams –

We have scheduled 'focused' meetings with your teams to further discuss and review land uses and scale within your Plan Areas. Both Team meetings are working group meetings, and are open to the public. We are holding both meetings the same night, however each Team will work independently with their Team facilitators. The focused Team Meetings are scheduled for:

Tuesday, May 14, 2013 from 4:00PM-8:00PM

North Lake Tahoe Event Center
8318 N Lake Blvd, Kings Beach

We will not be providing a meal, so please plan to either bring a sack-meal or eat before or after the meeting. We will be providing cookies and beverages and will break mid meeting for those that want to eat. Please contact Nicole Hagmaier at nhagmaie@placer.ca.gov to rsvp.

We look forward to seeing you on May 14th!

Tahoe CP Update Team

Thank you,
Nicole Hagmaier

Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA 95603
530-745-3117
nhagmaie@placer.ca.gov

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 12:30 PM
To: 'Sia Khosrovi'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: West Shore of Lake Tahoe

Sia and Marjorie,

Thank you for your input - we will ensure that it gets into the public record for the Planning Commission's consideration.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Sia Khosrovi [mailto:khosrovi@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 04, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: West Shore of Lake Tahoe

Dear Crystal Jacobsen,

As a part time resident of Tahoma I beg you to reconsider the expansion plans that threaten the tranquility of the neighborhoods and directly contributes to the lake's water clarity. Expanding the commercial viability and increased tax revenues of West Shore have to be reconciled with the needs of the environment.

Sincerely,

Sia and Marjorie Khosrovi
6620 McKinney Creek Rd.
Tahoma

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Greater Tahoe Plans

For the record...

From: sgearhart.fows@gmail.com [mailto:sgearhart.fows@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Susan Gearhart
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2013 8:21 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Judi Tornese; Steve Toschi; Bruce Carswell; Alexander Leff; Dana Spencer
Subject: Greater Tahoe Plans

Cyrstal,

At what point is a General Plan for Placer County Basin Plan being considered to reflect updates and changes in planning statements? Area Plans and Community Plans are being discussed but there should be an overall Tahoe Basin General Plan change required. Will an EIR be required with these Areas Plans such as Tahoe City? With a General Plan? What is your timeline for completion of these Tahoe Basin Plans? For the General Plan if applicable?

Thanks so much,

Susan
--
****
Susan R. Gearhart, President
Friends of the West Shore
P.O. Box 5095, Tahoe City, CA 96145
Phone: 530.525.0368
www.FriendsWestShore.org
****
"Working together to protect the West Shore, our watersheds, wildlife and rural quality of life, for today and future generations."

64

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 2:29 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: HHOA input to the Community Plan for the West Shore - Homewood

FYI

From: David Powell [mailto:JDPowell@stanford.edu]
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 10:41 PM
To: johnbpang@gmail.com; janbrisco@ltol.com; ktwomey@tcpud.org; lhaltick@gmail.com; talmontsnowremoval@att.net; ronparson@granlibakken.com; wilkinssm@cdm.com; toddmatherachitect@gmail.com; Jmtornese@aol.com
Cc: Crystal Jacobsen; Edmund Sullivan
Subject: Re: HHOA input to the Community Plan for the West Shore - Homewood

Dear West Shore General Plan team members and Placer County,

The Homewood Homeowners' Association discussed the General Plan at our last board meeting on January 31, 2013. In short, the board has concern about the extent of the proposed rezoning from residential to the MUR designation.

The board voted unanimously to recommend that the single family residential zoning for the 5 middle lots between South St. and Fawn St on the lake side of the highway be retained. For the lots across the highway from those 5 lots, the board also strongly supports single family zoning for the lots that now contain single family residences; i.e., those between Rockwood Lodge and the Museum.

In addition, the board also strongly supports single family residence zoning for the lots on the mountain side of highway 89 between Silver St. and Swiss Lakewood Lodge, with the exception of the real estate office on the corner of Silver St, Those lots are now all single family residences.

The general feeling of the board is that there will be plenty of new commercial activity in the expanded ski area project thus making the need for an additional increase in commercial zoning in other parts of Homewood unnecessary for the 15 - 20 year life of this West Shore General Plan update.

Sincerely,

David Powell, President
Homewood Homeowners' Association

165

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 2:28 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Community Plan for the West Shore - Homewood

FYI

From: Jmtornese@aol.com [mailto:Jmtornese@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 1:47 PM
To: johnbpang@gmail.com; janbrisco@ltol.com; ktwomey@tcpud.org; lhaltick@gmail.com; talmontsnowremoval@att.net; ronparson@granlibakken.com; wilkinssm@cdm.com; toddmatherachitect@gmail.com
Cc: Crystal Jacobsen; Edmund Sullivan
Subject: Community Plan for the West Shore - Homewood

Dear team members and Placer County,

I have heard from a number of homeowners in Homewood as well as the Homeowners Assn regarding the proposed zoning for Homewood under the new Community Plan. They also expressed their concerns at the Town Hall meeting on Feb. 6. The 3 main areas of concern are:

1. Changing from residential to commercial use is an issue. The team has proposed that the lakeside and mountain side of Hwy 89 change to MUR, which includes commercial use, for the entire area. This would not be consistent with the current use and 1998 General Plan (PAS 159), which states that this area is a mix of small commercial with some residential use. The proposed new map indicates that the 5 Lakefront parcels between Obexer's & Fawn St will be zoned to allow commercial, even though single family dwellings exist there now.

The Homewood HOA requested that I advise the West Shore team that these lakefront homeowners want to keep their lots as residential/single family dwellings and the Board of the Homewood HOA voted unanimously that it was their recommendation to retain the 5 lakefront lots from Fawn St. to Obexer's as residential/single family dwellings.

This is a legitimate concern of the homeowners, not only that their lots may be rezoned to allow commercial use but concern on what may be allowed on the property next door.

2. The proposed Homewood map also indicates that the residential areas on the mountain side between the Rockwood property and the Maritime Museum will be zoned commercial. Those lots all contain single family residences now.

3. The team also proposed 3 stories on the west side of Hwy 89 between Fawn and Grand View (street designation no longer exists). At our last meeting of Jan. 9, we reduced this area of 3 stories to run from South St. to the Grand View area (West Shore Sports). There is still some concern with 3 story buildings blocking the light to those single family dwellings west of San Souci, behind the 3 story area.

I wanted to alert you to these concerns and. on behalf of homeowners and the Homewood HOA, ask for your support to designate some parcels as residential/single family dwellings within the MUR zoned area to comply with what is currently in Homewood. I will bring the homeowner e-mails/letters to our next meeting for further discussion. Let me know if anyone wants to see them now.

Thanks,
Judi Tornese

166

Nicole Hagmaier

Subject: FW: Community Plan Working Group Request

-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Gregory [mailto:sgregorywork@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 4:52 PM
To: Leah Kaufman
Cc: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Community Plan Working Group Request

Dear Leah,
I am writing to you as a member of the North Tahoe West Community Plan Working Group that is developing guidelines for our Community Plan. Please share this letter with the rest of the group and consider our request, below.

We live on the former Cottonwoods property immediately to the west of the Tahoe Sands Resort at 6550 North Lake Blvd. Our Assessor's Parcel No. is 117-072-027-000. Our property is part of a three-residence compound, governed by CC&Rs. We are located at the extreme west end of Area 7a between the Tahoe Sands motel to the east and a strictly residential area to the west, with North Lake Blvd (SR 28) to the north and the lake to the south.

Since the three houses on our property are only residential in nature and since our CC&Rs prohibit commercial use of the property, we feel that it is appropriate to designate us residential, just like the other residential properties adjacent to us. Such a modification from the current zoning/land use proposal would only require that the west end of Area 7a be moved from the west edge of our property to the east edge, between us and the Tahoe Sands Resort.

This requested modification to the land use designation would simply correct an oversight that currently allows for commercial development on our strictly residential property.

Thank you in advance for the working group's consideration of this request. Please don't hesitate to ask if you require further information.

Very truly yours,
Steve Gregory
sgregorywork@gmail.com

cc: Crystal Jacobsen, Placer Co. Planning Services Division

169

Nicole Hagmaier

Subject: FW: Homewood Plan Area

From: Jan Brisco [mailto:janbrisco@ltol.com]
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 1:36 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen; Edmund Sullivan; Nicole Hagmaier; 'Shay Navarro'
Cc: 'John Pang'; 'Judith Tornese'; 'Kelli Towmey'; 'Lydia Altick'; 'Nancy Dodge'; 'Ron Parson'; 'Suzanne Wilkins'; 'Todd Mather'
Subject: Homewood Plan Area

Greetings:

It's been brought to my attention by several property owners in Homewood that the lakeside stretch between Homewood High and Dry (Silver Street) and Obexer's Marina (South Street) is being shown as part of the commercial core. I recall our group discussing the stretch of highway on the mountain side, but we never discussed changing the lakeside from residential to commercial. There are currently several single family residences in this area and we should not change the zoning designation that may potentially result in making them non-conforming.

By this email, I am requesting that this portion of Homewood be mapped residential, and remove the commercial designation between the two marinas. Again, I believe this was an error on the final map that is being circulated, and I would appreciate your confirming this correction at your earliest convenience.

Best,
Jan Brisco

168

February 2, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in protest of the proposed commercial zoning of the strip of residential homes from Obexer's to the north ending at Fawn St. I am a part of a family that owns property at 5240 West Lake Blvd.

My great-great grandfather, Thomas McConnell, purchased and subdivided a great portion of Homewood in 1886 with the intent of providing residential property for the enjoyment of the beauty and serenity of Homewood and Lake Tahoe. We have been owners of our property for over 110 years.

I don't understand why the proposed commercial zoning for a walk-able village center could possibly replace our residential property. Homewood is a wonderful, treasured part of the Lake. Why is this proposed zoning up for approval when there is a major Homewood ski area project on the table? Why target our residential properties for more commercial development at this time?

Thank you,

Kristie Carling

3840 Sleepy Hollow Drive

Reno, NV 89502

(775) 857-8292

Feb. 2, 2013

RE: Proposed Community Plan & Zoning Changes for the West Shore (Lake Tahoe)

To Whom It May Concern:

I urge you to reject any effort to allow commercial uses in a particular lakefront area of Homewood that is now -- and has been historically -- used for residential purposes.

The area in question is between Highway 89 and the lake, running from Obexer's north to Fawn Street, and is referenced in the proposed Community Plan & Zoning Changes for the West Shore that includes so-called village centers.

I am a member of a family that owns a home at 5240 West Lake Boulevard and a descendant of Thomas McConnell, who in the late 19th century developed Homewood as a residential refuge alongside Lake Tahoe.

My family and several other homeowners already have seen commercial uses erode the peaceful, serene character of this area and adversely affect the lakefront; one such example is the ongoing expansion of the marina complex (once known as High and Dry Marina) adjacent to Fawn Street.

Please don't misinterpret this letter as a plea to stop all commercial development in Lake Tahoe or even Homewood; there is an appropriate mix of land uses in every community. But there is no compelling reason to allow any commercial use in this particular area -- a residential area used expressly for that purpose for more than a century.

Commercial uses could trigger irreversible changes to this corner of the lake, which we all agree is a treasure that needs special attention and care. There very well may be appropriate lakefront properties for commercial uses in Placer County, but this area is certainly is not among them.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Kennedy

P.O. Box 2746
Edgartown, MA 02539

kennedyjohnh@gmail.com

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Edmund Sullivan
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2013 5:57 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Cc: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: FW: Friends of the West Shore

For the record

From: Jmtornese@aol.com [mailto:Jmtornese@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2013 5:21 PM
To: Edmund Sullivan
Subject: Fwd: Friends of the West Shore

Hi Ed,

This bulletin is for your info. Perhaps this Alert will encourage some input from the West Shore residents about the Community Plan. I also plan to send this alert to the West Shore team for their info. As we discussed, I will advise them about receiving a number of concerns from Homewood residents about changing current residential areas to mixed use (MUR) and also allowing a 3 story height limit (vs 2 story) on the West side of Hwy 89, across from Obexer's.

The lakefront homeowners between Obexer's and Fawn St. are particularly concerned and I hope we can address this with the rest of the West Shore team. I like your idea of reviewing these few lakefront parcels with the team & possibly reclassifying them as a Special Area of single family dwellings.

I don't think I can attend the Town Hall meeting on Feb. 6 but will be interested in any feedback. I think some of the concerned homeowners plan to attend. So we can review further after that meeting.

Judi

From: susan@friendswestshore.org
To: jmtornese@aol.com
Sent: 1/18/2013 8:20:09 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
Subj: Friends of the West Shore

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here

171

NEWS ALERT

TAHOE BASIN COMMUNITY PLANS
by Placer County

Learn about the New Proposed Community Plan & Zoning changes for the West Shore

When: Wednesday, February 6th at 6 PM
Where: Granlibakken Conference Center
725 Granlibakken Road, Tahoe City

Friends of the West shore would like to provide notice to all West Shore residents and homeowners about the Town Hall Meeting. We strongly encourage attendance at this important meeting where you can provide your input on the development of a Community Plan for the West Shore. This plan will determine future development for the next 20 years and will definitely affect everyone who is a resident/homeowner on the West Shore.

We particularly note the following proposed changes:

1. The current zoning in the three neighborhood centers of Sunnyside, Homewood and Tahoma is a mix of commercial in some areas, and separate residential in other areas. The land use/zoning is proposed to change to MUR (Mixed Use/Residential), including commercial use, for the entire area of these three neighborhood centers along

172

HWY 89.

2. The height limit in the three neighborhood centers will be 2 stories, except for a 3 story limit in Homewood on the mountain side of Hwy 89, currently proposed between Fawn St.and the area across from Obexer's.

The Community Plan is still a work in progress and there are many details to be determined, such as density, setbacks, parking etc. but **NOW IS THE TIME FOR YOUR INPUT! Please attend the Town Hall meeting on February 6th to give your comments and opinions. If you cannot attend the meeting, please send your comments to Placer County and the West Shore Team working on the plan:**

Crystal Jacobsen, Placer County Planning Services Division, 530.745.3085, cjacobse@placer.ca.gov and the West Shore Team: janbrisco@ltol.com. johnbpang@gmail.com, jmtornese@aol.com, ktwomey@tcpud.org, lhaltick@gmail.com, talmontsnowremoval@att.net, ronparson@granlibakken.com, wilkinssm@cdm.com, toddmatherachitect@gmail.com,
cc ESulliva@placer.ca.gov

For more information visit the Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update webpage:
http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/TahoeBasinCPUpdate.aspx

Friends of the West Shore
PO Box 5095, Tahoe City, CA 96145

Contact: FOWS President, Susan R. Gearhart by writing to susan@friendswestshore.org of if urgent call 530-525-0368

JOIN OUR MAILING LIST!
GO TO WWW.FRIENDSWESTSHORE.ORG AND JOIN!

Forward this email

This email was sent to jmtornese@aol.com by susan@friendswestshore.org |
Update Profile/Email Address | Instant removal with SafeUnsubscribe™ | Privacy Policy.
Friends of the West Shore | PO Box 5095 | Tahoe City | CA | 96145

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2013 6:48 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Cc: Edmund Sullivan
Subject: FW: Homewood Community Plan

For the record -

From: Lorie Cress [mailto:lcress7199@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2013 6:18 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: janbrisco@itol.com; johnbpang@gmail.com; jmtornese@aol.com; ktwomey@tcpud.org; lhaltick@gmail.com; talmontsnowremoval@att.net; ronparson@granlibakken.com; wilkinssm@cdm.com; toddmatherachitect@gmail.com
Subject: Homewood Community Plan

Ms. Jacobsen; I am not able to attend the meeting Feb. 6th but I want to express my feelings regarding the possible change in zoning of my residence at 5250 W. Lake Boulevard in Homewood. We went through this same zoning issue with Placer County in **1997**. I have a letter addressed to me and my husband from Fred Yeager, Planning Director stating that my property 97-140-38 was zoned commercial under the TRPA Plan Area Statement and Single Family Residential under the County zoning. The letter states the following: "The Committee's recommended new classification will be "residential" in keeping with your established use and desired classification". While we are located between two marinas we are a group of single family homes and I, for one, do not want my neighbor to suddenly be able to open a B&B or tear down their SFR and build an apartment building or any other commercial venue. We are single family residences, not commercial properties. Thank you, Lorie Cress

174

Att Crystal Jacobson

LAKE TAHOE PARTNERS, LLC
855 Bordeaux Way, Suite 200
P.O. Box 2490
Napa, California 94558
(707) 255-9890
(707) 253-8798 fax

January 25, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter will confirm that Joe Lanza is a tenant and consults with us on the proposed Sandy Beach development in Tahoe Vista California. If you have any questions please direct them to us.

Best regards,

Tim Wilkens
TW/me

Placer County Planning Commission
Auburn, California

January 21, 2013

Gentlemen,

Thank you for holding your Lake Tahoe Community Plan Update workshop on January 17 in Kings Beach. The recap of the planning process and the status update were, as always, clear and informative. And the opportunity to hear various points of view from you and from community members helped flesh out some of the dynamics of the planning effort.

It is with reference to one such speaker that I would like to respond. Alex Mourelatos mentioned that he would like to see a redesignation of the Tahoe Vista area into a more commercially-oriented district, which would allow more dense development. While I understand that Mr. Mourelatos, a motel owner, would like to see more commercial activity around his property, presumably to attract more guests, a number of us who live in the neighborhood (on both sides of North Lake Blvd. between National Ave. and Stag Dr.) would like to continue to maintain the current workable balance of residential and low-profile commercial use, primarily lodging and a couple of restaurants. We currently experience a manageable volume of traffic on the roads and a level of development that is compatible with the forest and shoreline ecosystems of the area.

The hospitality industry in North Tahoe has always been seasonal, with periods of low occupancy and revenues to be expected. If a hospitality property owner wants higher, Madison Avenue returns, then North Tahoe is probably the wrong place to be. So, I would like to request that a redesignation of the Tahoe Vista area to a higher-use commercial district not be made.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Very truly yours,
Steve Gregory

6550 North Lake Blvd.
Tahoe Vista
sgregorywork@gmail.com
415-377-5152

cc: Crystal Jacobsen
Jennifer Montgomery, Supervisor District 5

Crystal Jacobsen

From: Martha Bryan [info@cedarglenlodge.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 10:52 PM
To: Leah K
Cc: Laurie Gregory; Ann Nichols; bruce@eisenhard.net; Susan Gearhart NTCAA director; Sue Daniels; Steve Gregory; Alvina Patterson Tahoe Community; Benicia Foundry & Iron Works, Inc.; dalechamblin@gmail.com; Dana; Danielle Smith; dave mcclure; fran robinson; Gwen Rosser Tahoe Community; janet tuttle; jennifer kaufman; martha bryan; Nancy Eisenhard; Peter W. Grant; aamourelatos@gmail.com; Nicole Hagmaier; tahoeshootingstar@gmail.com; tahoellie@yahoo.com; lanzamiller@sbcglobal.net; keithf@martiscamp.com; tahoelodge@sbcglobal.net; boblyman@gmail.com; sam@arentz.com; Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Re: Its hell being a community advocate

Hello everybody,

I am not sure what's going on here with Alex's email regarding Leah's opinions. I don't want to judge or make any kind of assumptions or divisions. However, I would like to express a big and profound "thank you" to Leah Kaufman. We have burdened her with representing our interest to keep our area "rustic and rural." At this moment, we are too busy running our business and don't have the time to be at these meetings. Even though we are new here, we have been visiting Lake Tahoe for twenty years. We fell in love with the natural landscape, and from what I can gather from speaking with our guests, it's the very same reason they continue to visit Tahoe Vista and the surroundings! We are not against "progress" or "reconstruction." To the contrary, we recognize that many parts of Tahoe Vista are old and worn out and in desperate need of restoration if we are to be a successful tourist area. But, we must keep our natural, rustic charm, and differentiate ourselves from South Lake Tahoe. We must protect our natural assets and the only way to do so, is continuing with low rise and low density buildings. Mountain side properties, pedestrians and motorist have the right to enjoy our beautiful lake views. It is my hope that fifty years, one hundred and so on from now, our lake, mountains, and air will remain untouched and unpolluted.

It is OK to have different opinions and to disagree. We are all still neighbors and still need to respect, appreciate and support each other. We all have the right to express our opinions and wishes, and whatever those might be, nobody is better than the other. We must keep the dialog open, find a consensus and move forward.

Once again, thank you so much to Leah Kaufman for deeply caring about these important issues, for being a great land planer, neighbor and a friend! Thank you so much to TRPA for protecting our area and for granting and recognizing Cedar Glen Lodge with the Best in the Basin Award!

Best Regards,

Martha

6589 North Lake Tahoe Blvd
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148-0188
Local (530) 546-4281
Toll Free (800) 500-8246
Fax (530) 546-2250
info@cedarglenlodge.com
www.tahoecedarglen.com

On Thu, Jan 17, 2013 at 4:07 PM, Leah K <leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
I believe my intentions are good in sticking up for all you guys- Not that I am more important or that my vote counts more but the County tasked all of us to represent our community and I try to do that ahead of my own interests. Any thoughts appreciated. We need all of your support. Read below:
Leah

----- Original Message -----
From: Alex Mourelatos
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Cc: Bill Matte ; Ellie Waller ; Joseph Lanza ; Keith Franke ; Leah Kaufman ; Peter Przybyslawski ; Robert Lyman ; Sam Arentz ; Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 3:16 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Arlo answerFw: Area Plan boundaries and other information

Nicole and Crystal,

I feel it is important to comment on committee representation. I think what Leah does as a full time business and what Ellie does as a full time passion in caring about this community's future and planning for its growth are part of why they where chosen to be on the North Tahoe West planning committee to advise the County. I think we all bring valuable perspectives but I don't see myself as representing any specific set of Tahoe Vista stake holders other than the broader Tahoe North Community, businesses, residents and visitors. Nor do I think others on the committee feel they are arguing for a particular constituent on the multiple items we have voted on that have been literally all over the geographic map of our scope. If Leah thinks that because she spends her day talking to her clients, her opinion matters more than others, that is unfair. I am not at the table thinking I have a better answer to any of these challenges. I am at the table learning and contributing because I believe WE can achieve the vision we agreed to. We have a lot of work to do and a lot of input to provide in a number of areas including land use patterns and the resources we will collectively need in place to achieve a better Tahoe Vista community. Our personal opinions are important but I don't believe Leah's opinion carry's any more weight then Bill's or mine or Peter's. What is important is that many different perspectives are being herd, discussed and, in most cases we are coming to consensus on the recommendations we are voting on. I believe this was the intention and it is working in my opinion. I think more people should attend if they are willing to go through the details with the rest of us.

In hopes of working better together...

Alex Mourelatos

PS, I don't have the e-mail addresses of those Leah copied on her January 14, 2013 e-mail but I would appreciate someone passing on my thoughts so they have the benefit of another committee members' perspective.

On Mon, Jan 14, 2013 at 3:31 PM, Nicole Hagmaier <NHagmaie@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Our apologies, we meant to copy the team as well. See below ~ for your information.

Thank you,

Nicole

Placer County Planning Services Division

530-745-3117

nhagmaie@placer.ca.gov

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2013 3:24 PM
To: 'Leah K'; Alvina Patterson Tahoe Community; Chuck Pheil; janet tuttle; Martha Bryan; Darcie@keeptahoeblue.org; Shannon Eckmeyer; Arlo Stockham TRPA RPU
Cc: Bruce Eisenhard Tahoe Community; fran robinson; Ellie; sam@arentz.com; Laurie Gregory; Steve Gregory; pamchamblin@mac.com; John Hitchcock; Steve Buelna; Paul Thompson; Jennifer Merchant; Edmund Sullivan; Allen Breuch; Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Arlo answerFw: Area Plan boundaries and other information

Leah and all –

Please see the link below to the County's staff report for the January 17, 2013 Planning Commission hearing. The report includes discussion related to the team's work around scale and height and also includes staff's proposal related to the application and implementation of height standards within Town Centers and within commercial cores outside of Town Centers. Staff's proposal is consistent with the TRPA RPU and Code.

In addition, Leah, please also note the last attachment in the staff report, which includes correspondence received to date – including the letters you submitted for the CP Update public record.

See 10:10 AM Item – Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update Workshop: Part 1, Part 2, Part 3:

http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/Hearings.aspx

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions regarding the report.

Thank you,

Crystal Jacobsen

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603

530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) | 530.745.3080 (fax)| cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

---

From: Leah K [mailto:leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2013 3:08 PM
To: Alvina Patterson Tahoe Community; Chuck Pheil; janet tuttle; Martha Bryan; Crystal Jacobsen; Darcie@keeptahoeblue.org; Shannon Eckmeyer; Arlo Stockham TRPA RPU
Cc: Bruce Eisenhard Tahoe Community; fran robinson; Ellie; sam@arentz.com; Laurie Gregory; Steve Gregory; pamchamblin@mac.com; John Hitchcock
Subject: Re: Arlo answerFw: Area Plan boundaries and other information

Arlo, John,

I am a bit confused after our last Area Plan Team meeting that Arlo attended and spoke at and hope you can answer some questions for me.

I was under the impression in talking with John Hitchcock at previous meetings as well as the League that Town Centers (i.e. Kings Beach and Tahoe City) on the CA North Shore are the only areas eligible for extra height and density over the TRPA current code requirements.

However, in the documents the County has passed out for Tahoe Vista (North Tahoe West) the entire highway side of Tahoe Vista shows up to 48 feet of height. (four stories) I thought John H told our plan team that this is not consistent with the RPU so I was surprised to see this on the County planning documents handed out.

Additionally, I believe that Ellie and I are the only two people on our team who have engaged other property owners within the CP area. i.e. I have personally spoken with Cedar Glen, Lodge, Tahoe Vista Chalets, Cottonwood Estates, Vista Pines, Beasley's Cottages, Tahoya Shores, Redwolf Lakeside Lodge, Holiday House, Tahoe Vista Lodge, Rustic Cottages, Bruce Eisenhard, Fran Robinson, the single family dwellings along Anderson Ave etc etc to ask them their opinion regarding what they would like to see and none of these people want four stories of height in Tahoe Vista. Letters were submitted to both TRPA and Placer County yet I am not sure who is reading these letters and where they should be vetted. i.e. Planning Commission/Governing Board etc.??

Crystal has requested that our plan teams think about what the community wants but unfortunately it is my personal opinion that this is simply not occurring at our team meetings and I am not sure how the remaining Community also within this plan area are to be accurately represented? What ultimately happens when there isn't consensus amongst our team members? What happens if County planning documents are not consistent with RPU documents?.

Could you confirm TRPA thinking on this subject ? Thanks,

Leah Kaufman

| -----

181

--
Alex Mourelatos
Mourelatos Lakeshore Resort
415-990-6234 Cell
530-546-9500 MLR

MOURELATOS
LAKESHORE RESORT

Mourelatos Lake Shore Resort
6834 North Lake Boulevard
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148

January 17, 2013

Crystal Jacobsen
Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Planning Commission Hearing Regarding the Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update

Dear Ms. Jacobsen:

My name is Alex Mourelatos and I am one of the family owners of the Mourelatos Lakeshore Resort in Tahoe Vista. My father and mother acquire the 23 acre resort in 1978 and our family has continuously owned and operated the resort that consists of 32 room lakefront units with 30 more across highway 28 and a set of seasonal concessions including a very popular ice cream shop.

I have been a participant as a community representative on the Lake Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update, North Tahoe West Team. The vision statement for the North Tahoe West Community plan area notes that "It is a place where socio-economic diversity is welcome, and a place that combines stunning vistas, an abundance of accessible recreation, and a variety of restaurants, retail and diverse lodging. Through out the year the Plan Area maintains a vibrant business community with walk-ability, quality lighting and accessibility..."

As the Planning Commission considers the status of the Community Plan Update Process, I would urge you to consider not only the form and design of allowable development within the Community Plan Area but also what elements of redevelopment are necessary to deliver on the vision of year round vibrant restaurants, retail and lodging in walkable and accessible format.

Presently the current built environment and the allowable land use patterns in Tahoe Vista makes achieving year round vibrancy as a small business owner extremely difficult. Without the necessary amenities such as on site outdoor recreation, group event and meeting space and walk able retail and dining, the Tahoe Vista Village Center will continue to be an area which requires local and visitor dependence on the automobile and we will continue to suffer from very low occupancy from April to June and mid September to mid December.

I believe that it is imperative that as we draft our new Community Plans that in addition to defining the acceptable building form and design guidelines, we also evaluate the allowed land use patterns to determine if we have truly created a community which is capable of successfully achieving our stated vision.

In the coming weeks and months I would propose to work with the County and TRPA to focus analysis on the attributes and amenities that must be present in order to achieve year round vibrancy. It is my hope that this comprehensive economic evaluation will help to draft and approve a North Tahoe West Plan area that has the necessary elements to realistically achieve its environmental, social and economic goals.

Sincerely,

Alex Mourelatos, Owner
Mourelatos Lakeshore Resort
Tahoe Vista